REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 16-18, 20-22, 24, 27 and 30 have been amended. Claims 1-40 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-16 and 30-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite.

With regard to claim 1, the Office Action states "the essential structural cooperative relationships between the so-called 'one or more devices,' 'arbiter,' and 'one or more power supply [sic]' have been omitted." However, claim 1 clearly recites that the devices are each configured to assert a voltage request and the arbiter is configured to receive the voltage requests asserted by the devices. Claim 1 also clearly recites that the arbiter is configured to output the chosen voltage request to one or more power supplies and each of the one or more power supplies is configured to receive the chosen voltage request. Therefore, cooperative relationships are clearly recited between each element in claim 1. The particular structure used to implement these relationships is not limiting on the invention. For example, the exact manner by which the devices assert the voltage requests and the arbiter receives the voltage requests is not critical. In other words, any structure suitable in a computer system may be used for the arbiter to receive voltage requests asserted by the devices. Section 112, second paragraph, does not require that Applicants limit their claims to any particular structure. Applicants remind the Examiner that breadth of a claim is not to be equated with indefiniteness. *In re Miller*, 441 F.2d 689, 169 USPQ 597 (CCPA 1971). Applicants also remind the Examiner that there is nothing inherently wrong with defining an invention in functional terms. *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971).

With regard to claims 12 and 38, the Office Action states the phrase "to choose a low power voltage request" cannot be ascertained because "none of the devices are present." It appears that the Examiner is asserting that this is inconsistent with claim 1 which recites "a plurality of devices." However, the Examiner should note that the phrase "none of the devices are present" is a part of the conditional phrase "if the plurality of device present signals indicate that none of the devices are present." The arbiter may be configured to handle various conditions in addition to the particular condition recited in claim 1. In other words, just because claim 1 recites that devices are present, that does not mean that the arbiter can not also be capable of handling the case where no devices are present. Also, this limitation is not recited in claim 38. Therefore, the rejection of claim 38 is improper.

With regard to claim 30, for reasons analogous to those given with regard to claim 1 above, Applicants assert that claim 30 is not indefinite.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 11-21, 30-32 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Voegeli et al. (U.S. Patent 6,448,672) (hereinafter "Voegeli"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Voegeli does not teach that if any of the voltage requests asserted by the devices specify a voltage that is distinct from the voltage specified by any other of the voltage requests asserted by the devices, the arbiter is configured to choose a voltage request and to output the chosen voltage request to the one or more power supplies, wherein each of the one or more power supplies is configured to receive the chosen voltage request and to provide a voltage that corresponds to the chosen voltage request to the devices such that the devices receive the same supply voltage. Instead, at col. 9, line 67 through col. 10,

line 2, Voegeli teaches a power system controller that interprets requests for two or more distinct voltages as an un-resolvable conflict and is only configured to report an error condition. Therefore, Voegeli teaches that the conflict must be resolved before a voltage can be supplied. Therefore, Voegeli clearly does not anticipate claim 1. Independent claims 17 and 30 are not anticipated for similar reasons

Applicants also note that several of the dependent claims are further distinguishable over Voegeli. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentable, a detailed discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 6-10, 22-26 and 33-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voegeli. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

With regard to claims 6-8, 22-24 and 33-35, the Office Action states that Voegeli does not teach or suggest "the use of a 'low power signal' to indicate whether the devices should be placed in sleep or idle mode". The Examiner takes official notice that placing a device under sleep or idle mode using a low power indicative signal is well known. However, although placing a device under sleep or idle mode using a low power indicative signal may be well known in other contexts, the use of a low power signal in a voltage request arbiter as claimed in combination with the other limitations of Applicants' claims is not known in the prior art. The prior art does not suggest combining such functionality with a voltage request arbiter. The Examiner points to the other cited references. However, none of the cited art mentions a low power signal or for that matter makes any reference to power saving modes of operation, let alone suggesting this functionality in a voltage request arbiter as claimed by Applicants. Therefore, the rejection is improper.

A similar argument applies in regard to the limitations of claims 9, 10, 25, 26 and 36-39.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicants hereby petition for such extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5500-64900/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

☐ Petition for Extension of Time

☐ Notice of Change of Address

☐ Fee Authorization Form authorizing a deposit account debit in the amount of $ for fees ( ).

☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,

Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: October 13, 2003